

are the most likely to join the military. This means that the Impact Aid program is not only helping families now on active duty but also educating young men and women who are the most likely to become the future backbone of the armed forces.

This bill was the first piece of legislation that I introduced in the 107th Congress. We attracted above 20 co-sponsors. In the 108th Congress, we attracted above 40 co-sponsors. Clearly the time is coming when this bill must become law.

Our constitution commands that the first job of the federal government is to "provide for the common defense." As we improve the pay and benefits of men and women in uniform, we must also support their kids and the local schools they attend. This may take many years to accomplish but the time is now to support schools that educate the children whose parents wear our Nation's uniform. Let us recognize our duty to America's children and to our military.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION THAT IS IMPORTANT TO RANCHERS AND CONSUMERS

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague, Representative BARBARA CUBIN of Wyoming, to introduce a piece of legislation that we believe is vitally important for the ranchers of our states and for consumers across the country.

On December 29, 2004, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced regulations that would enable certain countries, including Canada, to qualify as "minimal-risk regions" for the disease bovine spongiform encephalopathy or BSE. Thus, on March 7, 2005, Canadian cattle will again be allowed into the United States after a 19-month moratorium on those animals due to a BSE outbreak in that country. Since the announcement of that rule, the government of Canada has discovered and confirmed two additional cases of BSE in that country's cattle herd. Despite this fact, USDA has not announced an intention to re-examine the rule or to postpone the date that it will open our borders to Canadian cattle.

Language to require country-of-origin labeling (COOL) for certain meat and perishable agricultural products was included in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, also known as the 2002 Farm Bill. Under that law, this provision was set to become operational on September 30, 2004. Unfortunately, Congress has postponed the implementation date for COOL until September 30, 2006. Even more distressing, opponents of COOL have begun an effort to replace the mandatory COOL program with a voluntary one.

Mandatory COOL is important policy for several reasons. First, it would distinguish American meat products from those that are being imported into this country. This would enable American ranchers and pork producers and others to promote domestically produced meat products that rancher in my state believe

are superior to meat and live animals produced in other countries.

Secondly, it will give American consumers information that they have repeatedly stated they want about the origin of the meat that they buy at the grocery store. American consumers know where virtually all of their consumer goods are manufactured, but not something as important as the food that they provide for their families. They want this information and they should have access to it.

Providing consumers with access to country-of-origin information becomes particularly important in light of our Department of Agriculture's intention open the border to animals from a country that has recently found multiple cases of BSE.

This bill would prevent USDA from opening the Canadian border to cattle imports until after a mandatory COOL program is up and running. Consumers want this information, and producers will benefit from having this information available. It is good policy and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO COMMEMORATE THE SPIRIT OF CESAR E. CHAVEZ: "SÍ SE PUEDÉ"

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a great American leader and hero, Cesar Chavez. He was a husband, father, grandfather, labor organizer, community leader and symbol of the ongoing struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity.

Cesar was the son of migrant farm workers who dedicated his life to fighting for the human rights and dignity of farm laborers. He was born on March 31, 1927, on a small farm near Yuma, Arizona, and died nearly 12 years ago in April of 1993. Over the course of his 66-year life, Cesar Chavez' work inspired millions and made him a major force in American history.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez and his family founded the National Farm Workers Association which organized thousands of farm workers to confront one of the most powerful industries in our nation. He inspired them to join together and non-violently demand safe and fair working conditions.

Through the use of a grape boycott, he was able to secure the first union contracts for farm workers in this country. These contracts provided farm workers with the basic services that most workers take for granted, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities. Because of his fight to enforce child labor laws, farm workers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the migrant schools he helped to establish. In addition, Cesar Chavez made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farm workers and consumers face every day.

As a labor leader, he earned great support from unions and elected officials across the country. The movement he began continues today as the United Farm Workers of America.

Cesar Chavez' influence extends far beyond agriculture. He was instrumental in forming the Community Service Organization, one of the first civic action groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona.

He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives and brought complaints against mistreatment by government agencies. He taught community members how to deal with governmental, school and financial institutions and empowered many thousands to seek further advancement in education and politics. There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, church leaders, organizers and other hardworking professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by groups from all walks of life and all religions to help bring calm with his non-violent practices. In his fight for peace, justice, respect and self-determination, he gained the admiration and respect of millions of Americans and most Members of this House of Representatives.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farm workers, children and the poor throughout the United States and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans.

We in Congress must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught are preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure that these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. In the words of Cesar and the United Farm Workers, sí se puede—yes, we can!

HONORING THE LIFE OF 1LT NAINOA K. HOE, USA

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life, passion, and patriotism of Nainoa K. Hoe, First Lieutenant, United States Army, a fallen American hero.

Although I have shared the stories of selflessness and sacrifice of our fallen soldiers before, this time is different.

First Lieutenant Hoe never lived in the Congressional District I represent. Truth be told, he never lived in Oregon. But his wife Emily, her family, and their friends were hopeful about the day he might.

His widow is a senior at Western Oregon University; she is proud of him and his contribution. Her greatest concern has been for her husband's men, his family, and the friends in their life.

It seems that bravery, commitment to service, and honor were personality traits shared by husband and wife. The young Hoe family will not get the years they deserved, but they are an example of love that we should all strive to emulate.

Just days ago, First Lieutenant Hoe was killed while leading his platoon on a foot patrol in Mosul. With him, the dreams of a radiant

young couple with so much to offer—so many things to live and do—were buried in the sand of a country in transition.

Sadly, First Lieutenant Hoe was almost home. His rotation nearly completed, he was scheduled to return to the Pacific Northwest on February 6, 2005.

Though proud of his contribution to the long-term stability of Iraq and its people, he was an excited newlywed, looking forward to building a family, winning a position at the FBI, and enjoying the freedoms he had worked so hard to protect.

For Nainoa, courage was a family value. He believed that military service was an expected privilege; a duty that he proudly discharged. He reveled in his role as a commander of a combat platoon—a duty similar to the kind his father Allen Hoe completed during his time in Vietnam.

First Lieutenant Hoe believed there was nothing more important—no duty more sacred—than defending the ideals of this Nation, of fighting for a cause greater than him.

He believed these things knowing full well it meant risking his life, liberty, and his own happiness.

I believe we live in a smaller world these days. It grows smaller with each tragedy such as this. Every life matters—especially when it holds such promise.

Oregonians today are feeling the loss. Let us commit ourselves, here—in this chamber—to work even harder and do our part to make sound decisions about matters of peace and war; to be worthy of the trust Nainoa K. Hoe placed in our hands.

Let us pledge ourselves to being worthy of the sacrifice Nainoa freely offered; we owe him, and those that will follow, nothing less.

FREE SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, a Congressman from Ohio entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent newspaper account concerning his legal proceeding against Representative JIM McDERMOTT, my friend and colleague from Washington State. I was struck by this.

This story began with two newspaper accounts over 7 years ago. If we are going to reflect on this, I think it is only fair that Members of the House and the American people have access to the same basic information, so they can make up their own minds.

In this spirit, I am entering into the RECORD, and I would urge everyone to read, newspaper accounts carried by the New York Times and the Atlanta Journal Constitution. These stories disclosed efforts by then-Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich and Republican Members to skirt an agreement Gingrich had reached with the Ethics Committee.

At issue today are substantial issues concerning Free Speech and Freedom of the Press. The Courts have yet to render a full and final decision. While the legal process is

underway, I believe we serve this House and the American people best by taking the time to be fully and fairly informed.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1997]

GINGRICH IS HEARD URGING TACTICS IN ETHICS CASE

(By Adam Clymer)

On the day in December when Newt Gingrich admitted bringing discredit on the House, his lawyer told Republican leaders that the Speaker had promised an ethics subcommittee not to use his office and his allies to orchestrate a Republican counterattack against the committee's charges.

That was part of the price for the subcommittee's agreement to accept his admission of guilt and spare him the potential humiliation of a full-scale public trial.

But that same day, even before the charges had been made public, Mr. Gingrich held a telephone conference call with other House leaders in which he made suggestions for a statement that the leaders would issue immediately after the subcommittee's charges were disclosed.

He also suggested the timing of various responses to Democratic attacks. The politicians agreed among themselves how they could use their opponents' comments to attack the subcommittee's findings indirectly without technically violating the agreement that Mr. Gingrich's lawyers made with the ethics subcommittee.

The call was taped by people in Florida who were unsympathetic to Mr. Gingrich and who said they heard it on a police scanner that happened to pick up the cellular telephone transmissions of one of the participants. It was given to a Democratic Congressman, who made the tape available to The New York Times. Mr. Gingrich's office today did not question the authenticity of the conversation, but insisted that it did not violate any agreement with the ethics subcommittee.

The Speaker and his allies acknowledged at the time that their conversation was a bit "premature," since the subcommittee had not yet even voted on the charges against Mr. Gingrich. Nevertheless, they talked about how to handle inevitable Democratic attacks, how to time the day's events with newspapers, news agencies and the evening television news in mind, and—above all—how to avoid making all that look as if Mr. Gingrich was pulling the strings.

In the Dec. 21 conversation, Mr. Gingrich's lawyer, Ed Bethune, said, "it is very important for me to be able to say to the special counsel and if necessary to the committee members that we—and by that I mean the other attorney, Randy Evans, and I, and Newt—have done everything in our power to try to stop all things that might be construed in any way as an orchestration attempt by Newt Gingrich."

Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Bethune and the others discussed their tactics in a conference telephone call, a transcript of which was made available by a Democratic Congressman hostile to Mr. Gingrich who insisted that he not be identified further.

The Congressman said the tape had been given to him on Wednesday by a couple who said they were from northern Florida. He quoted them as saying it had been recorded off a radio scanner, suggesting that one participant was using a cellular telephone. They said it was recorded about 9:45 A.M. on Dec. 21.

The tape, in which the voices of Mr. Gingrich and other Republican leaders are clearly recognizable, was plainly a recording of a

conversation that took place before the subcommittee released its charges and Mr. Gingrich's admissions.

The call capped a week of elaborate plea-bargaining over the framing of the charges—and Mr. Gingrich's admission—that the Speaker had brought discredit on the House by giving untrue information to the ethics committee and by failing to get proper legal advice about the way he used money from tax-exempt foundations for a college course and televised town meetings with political overtones.

Mr. Gingrich's admission of guilt avoided a full-scale trial in which the details would have been televised nationally. In return, the committee's special counsel, James M. Cole, insisted on a promise that the Speaker would not use his allies to mount a counterattack against the subcommittee's case, since its rules forbade Mr. Cole and members from answering such attacks.

The tone of the conversation was optimistic. The Speaker and the other leaders believed that a coordinated response could enable them to limit political fallout.

And the talk, one of many that day, ended on a light note. After the basic outlines of the statement the leaders would issue had been agreed on, Representative Dick Army of Texas, the majority leader, had another suggestion for how Mr. Gingrich could handle the menacing accusation that he had deliberately lied to the committee: "I am not sure you are ready for this, but you could quote Larry Gatlin and the Gatlin Brothers."

Mr. Gingrich asked, "Which one is that?"

Mr. Arney warbled: "I did not mean to deceive you. I never intended to push or shove. I just wish that you was someone that I love."

Today, Lauren Maddox, a spokeswoman for Mr. Gingrich, defended the Speaker's role. She said: "Newt has always had the right to run for Speaker and campaign. Any statement he made was in no way undermining the work of the committee."

She added: "There was a specific agreement between Newt's lawyers and the special counsel that Newt could brief the leadership. And it was always understood that in turn, the leadership could respond in any way they thought was appropriate."

In the December conversation, Mr. Bethune said in a couple of hours, once the subcommittee announced its actions, "it would also be a time when we are authorized to have the conversation that we are having now, a little prematurely. But I don't think it would be troubling to anyone that we are a little ahead of the gun."

Mr. Cole would not comment today, but the conversation itself suggested that the situation at the time seemed more complicated than Ms. Maddox contended.

Mr. Bethune, who served with Mr. Gingrich in the House for six years and now practices law in Washington, made several efforts to outline the slippery path that all must follow. One ally asked him what the leaders should say about any agreement between Mr. Gingrich and the subcommittee.

The lawyer replied: "No. I didn't say there was an agreement. I said there was a delicate process under way and that this is what Newt is going to do, in response to the delicate process. There is no agreement, no deal. We are not authorized to say that."

"Now if I can be very delicate here. There is one other constraint," Mr. Bethune continued. "He can run for Speaker, but he must maintain his confidentiality as far as public statements. And then, finally, Newt will not